DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 943 JC 720 117

AUTHOR Gulassa, Cyril M.; Caldwell, Florin L.
TITLE Phase One: Study of Objectives for English 1A Classes. Transfer Level Composition at De Anza College.
INSTITUTION De Anza Coll., Cupertino, Calif.
PUB DATE 1 May 72
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Composition Skills (Literary); *Course Objectives; *English Instruction; *Evaluation; *Junior Colleges; Reading Skills; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; Values; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS California

ABSTRACT

In order to evaluate the transfer-level English composition program at De Anza College (California), English composition teachers and students rated 80 objectives in the categories of composition, values, reading, and writing. Objectives were rated on a one-to-five scale. Each objective was ranked as primary, secondary, or optional, according to faculty rating. For the primary objectives, comparisons were made between instructor emphasis and student helpfulness. Conclusions were reached in each area: (1) composition--students receive more help in acquiring structural skills than thought skills; (2) values--teachers placed strong emphasis on understanding oneself and one's relationship to others; (3) reading--teachers' main objective was the need to teach students to read with greater understanding; and (4) writing assignments--only in this area was there a high level of congruence, probably due to the emphasis on procedures rather than skills. (RN)

ED 061943

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PHASE ONE: STUDY OF OBJECTIVES FOR ENGLISH 1A CLASSES: TRANSFER LEVEL COMPOSITION AT DE ANZA COLLEGE

JC 720 117

BY

Cyril M. Gulassa - English Instructor
Florin L. Caldwell - Director of Institutional Research

May 1, 1972
De Anza College
Cupertino, California

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 8 1972

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

INTRODUCTION

Several important events motivated the undertaking of this study. Recently, the Foothill Community College District initiated a program of institutional research designed to gather specific data that would help develop and improve the curricula and formulate overall District policy. The inauguration of this program was timely because in an era of diminishing budgets and cost accountability, a careful examination of the purpose and direction of the institution was necessary.

When English Composition was dropped as a specified general requirement by the State of California, it seemed appropriate to reevaluate the English 1A program whose cost represented a significant portion of the total curriculum budget.

The composition program, moreover, was considered loosely organized, lacking discipline and focus. The trend toward more teacher independence which included the freedom to select texts, structure courses, and develop methodology independently of others teaching the same course had led many in the college community to believe, including the composition teachers themselves, that each composition course was as different from the next as algebra was from history. The Language Arts Division, therefore, decided to initiate a Phase I study to determine if there were any commonly held objectives in the teaching of transfer level (1A) composition at De Anza College.

PURPOSE

The major purpose of Phase I study was to evaluate the transfer level Composition Program (English 1A) at De Anza College in the three following areas:

1. To determine if a common set of objectives existed among the English 1A staff for teaching composition and reading.

2. To measure the degree to which the English 1A staff emphasized such objectives in their teaching.

3. To measure the degree to which the English 1A students felt such objectives were helpful to them.

It was also felt that the congruence between the degree of teacher emphasis and degree of student perception of helpfulness on the same objectives could provide some indication of instructor influence upon students.

METHODOLOGY

Initially, an attempt was made to acquire a list of objectives through group discussions of the aims and goals of composition, but the results were inconclusive. Instead, a list of 80 objectives

was obtained in part from (1) the existing course guides for composition, (2) a culling of the objectives implied in the organization and content of the many different readers and handbooks in actual use during the quarter, and (3) comments by individual teachers. The design of the questionnaire is a composite based on the models presented in Richard L. Larson's monograph, The Evaluation of Teaching College English, (ERIC), 1970.

The 80 objectives were grouped into four broad categories: (a) Composition, (b) Values, (c) Reading, and (e) Writing Assignments. When appropriate, objectives in each section were arranged according to the degree of abstraction, the most abstract first followed by increasingly sopcific objectives.

Complementary questionnaires were given to all English 1A instructors (14) and all students enrolled in English 1A classes (227) for one quarter. Teachers were asked to identify the degree to which they emphasized each given objective on a five point scale: (a) Heavy Emphasis, (b) Modest Emphasis, (c) Some Emphasis, (d) Little or No Emphasis, and (e) Not Taught. The students were asked to estimate the degree to which they felt the same objective had helped them. They too were asked to respond on a five-point scale: (a) Very Helpful, (b) Moderately Helpful, (c) Somewhat Helpful, (d) Little or No Help, (e) Not Taught as Part of This Course.

By indicating how heavily they emphasized each objective, the teachers were actually selecting according to a modified form of the Delphi system what they felt were the important aims of the composition program. To encourage thoughtful response to each objective, the teachers were reminded that an identical survey was being given to their students and that the degree of congruence between teacher-student responses would be established.

Student and instructor responses to the questionnaires were converted into a Likert scale. The scale ran from a low of 1.00, which indicated that the subject was not taught at all, to a high of 5.00, which indicated perfect unanimity that either "emphasis" (teachers) or "helpfulness" (students) was at maximum.

The objectives were identified and ranked according to the following criteria:

A. 3.75 to 5.00 instructor rating means were identified as primary objectives. This rating meant that 75 percent or more of the staff (11 or more out of 14) felt that the objective was worthy of heavy or at least moderate emphasis.

B. 3.00 to 3.74 instructor ratings were classified as secondary objectives. This meant that from 60 to 74 percent of the staff (9 to 11 out of 14) regarded the objective as worthy of heavy or at least moderate emphasis.

C. The remaining objectives (2.99 to 1.00 instructor ratings) were considered as optional objectives determined by the individual preferences of the instructors.

D. Student responses were also divided into similar categories as to degree of helpfulness.

1. 3.75 to 5.00 student ratings indicated that the objective was of primary help to them. (75 to 100 percent of students regarded objective helpful)

2. 3.00 to 3.74 student ratings indicated that the objective was of secondary help to them (60 to 74 percent of students regarded objective helpful)

3. 0 to 2.99 student ratings indicated that the objective was of optional help to them. (less than 59% of the students indicated objective helpful)

Once the primary objectives had been identified, comparisons of instructors' ratings were made with the students' ratings for the same objectives. If a difference beyond the .01 level of significance existed between the means of the instructors' ratings and that of the students', the objectives were said to have little congruence between the help found by the students and the emphasis placed upon the same objective by the instructor. Comparisons to determine significant differences between the means of instructor and student ratings were only calculated on those objectives identified by instructors as primary objectives.

FINDINGS (See Tables I, II, III, IV in Appendix)

Responses to the survey indicated that the English 1A staff identified 46 primary objectives (Table I): (a) 19 in the area of composition; (b) 13 in the area of values; (c) Seven in the area of reading; and (d) Seven in the area of writing assignments.

The staff also identified 25 secondary objectives (Table II): (a) 10 in the area of composition; (b) 11 in the area of values; (c) 4 in the area of reading; and (d) 0 in the area of writing assignments.

The 9 remaining objectives were listed as optional depending upon the instructors' individual preference (Table III): (a) 4 in the area of composition, (b) 4 in the area of values, (c) 1 in the area of reading, and (d) 0 in the area of writing assignments.

In order to obtain the information on Table IV, the following steps were taken:

1. On the objectives identified as primary (75%+ agreement of all instructors in the study) a two-tailed test of significance of differences between means was made between instructors' mean ratings of emphasis and students' mean ratings of helpfulness and Z scores obtained.

2. The objectives were then ranked in order by their Z scores from smallest to largest under each area (Composition, Values, Reading, Writing Assignments).

3. If the Z score obtained for the objective was less than 2.576 or the .01 level of significance, the difference between the means was said not to be significant and that for the objective congruence existed between what the instructors said they were emphasizing and what the students found to be helpful to them. See Table IV--Objectives 1-9 under Composition; Objectives 1-8 under Values; Objectives 1 and 2 under Reading; and all Objectives under Writing Assignments.

4. If the Z score obtained was greater than 2.576 or the .01 level of significance, the difference between the means was said to be significant and that for the objective no congruence existed between what the instructors said they were emphasizing and the students found to be helpful to them. See Table IV--Objectives 10-19 under Composition; Objectives 9-13 under Values; and Objectives 3-7 under Reading. There were no objectives under Writing Assignments that showed a lack of congruence between instructors and students.

Thus, the results of the comparison of mean instructors' ratings to mean students' ratings on the same objectives and dealing with instructor identified primary objectives only, showed that in the areas of: (a) Composition--there were 9 objectives where more congruence existed and 10 objectives where little congruence existed; (b) Values--there were 8 objectives where more congruence existed and 5 objectives where little congruence existed; (c) Reading--there were 2 objectives where more congruence existed and 5 objectives where little congruence existed; (d) Writing Assignments--all 7 objectives indicated a high level of congruence between teacher emphasis and student helpfulness. Table IV summarizes the results of the comparisons of instructor emphasis and student helpfulness on the primary objectives.

CONCLUSIONS

Out of 80 possible objectives, the staff identified 57% (forty-six) as primary objectives for teaching English 1A. This consensus indicated that the instructors were in much greater accord about teaching objectives than had been anticipated. Indeed, such traditional goals as good paragraph structure, sound reasoning, basic human values, and good reading skills appeared to be the common denominator of the 1A program at De Anza.

The conclusions of this study are divided into four areas that correspond with the four parts of the questionnaire.

I. COMPOSITION

The composition objectives fell into two broad categories--those dealing with thought skills and those dealing with structural skills. In general, the responses suggested that the students received more help in acquiring structural skills than thought skills.

A. Structural skills: Traditionally the most important purpose of the 1A program is to insure that a student learns to write competently, and it appears that the teachers did well in conveying how to construct good themes. Such basics as thesis statement, (L.C.2)* organization, (I.C.17) paragraph structure, (I.C.15) development, (I.C.6) and use of specifics (I.C.6) were heavily emphasized, and the students felt that the program was very helpful.

B. Thought skills: Also of traditional importance to the 1A program is the teaching of thought skills, especially the principles of argumentation, and it appears that here, too, the faculty recognized its responsibility. If all composition skills were ranked according to the degree of teacher emphasis, those pertaining to argumentation were at the very top of the list. In fact, concerning recognition of issues (I.C.3), assumptions and inferences (I.C.4); and learning how to develop sound generalizations (I.C.7),

---

*I.C.2: Roman numeral (I) indicates Table number; Letter (C) indicates Area (Composition); Number (2) indicates Objective in specified area. This code is used throughout the conclusions to identify objectives in the supporting tables.

acquire adequate evidence (I.C.1), and identify propositions (I.C.3), the teachers almost unanimously agreed that those items should receive substantial emphasis.

Although the staff emphasized thought skills, the degree of congruence here was not as high as for structural skills. Of the eleven primary objectives pertaining strictly to thought skills (I.C.1,3,4,7,8,9.10,12,13,16,19), only three objectives (8,10,16) were moderately congruent, whereas of the seven objectives relevant to structural skills (I.C.2, 6,11,14,15,17,18), all but one (11) received moderate to high degrees of congruence. The 1A teachers appeared to be more helpful in teaching structural skills than thought skills Some speculations:

1. Because of their higher degree of abstraction, thought skills are traditionally more difficult to teach and require a higher degree of discipline and intelligence to understand.

2. The teachers may lack good techniques for teaching and testing thought concepts, or they may rely on hit-miss approaches rather than systematic analysis. Several teachers, for example, indicated that they study individual essays for logical strengths and weaknesses, but they do not approach argumentation as an organized body of knowledge. The fact that study of the syllogism (II.C.1) is not a primary objective tends to confirm this conclusion. While the teacher need not approach logic as an elaborate science, sound pedagogy requires that he make the student aware of the relationships between the various principles of the discipline.

C. Grammatical skills: Of special interest is the fact that avoidance of gross sentence errors, such as fragments, comma splices, etc.(I.C.5) was ranked fifth in the order of emphasis by the teachers, but received the lowest degree of congruence of all of the primary objectives. Whatever means the teachers were using to implement this objective, therefore, were not proving very helpful to the student.

D. Mechanical skills: Since they were classified as secondary or optional objectives, there was a definite deemphasis of such mechanical skills as spelling (III.C.3), punctuation (II.C.7), vocabulary (II.C.6), outlining (III.C.4), and the avoidance of minor grammatical errors (II.C.4). Many of these skills received greater stress in more basic and remedial courses in composition so that by the time the student arrived in 1A he was expected to be proficient. The diminishing stress on mechanics, however, may reflect the national trend toward the easing of the rigid standards of "correct" English.

E. Research skills: Learning how to use the library (II.C.10), and the principles and techniques of the term paper (II.C.8), were no longer primary objectives of the 1A program. When queried, teachers replied that the brevity of the quarter system militated against the continuation of these traditional objectives.

II. VALUES

The study revealed that the 1A teachers placed strong emphasis on values which promoted an understanding of oneself (I.V.8) and ones relationship to others and society (I.V.4), and which encouraged involvement (I.V.9), tolerance (I.V.1), and awareness of the complexity of most human problems (I.V.3).

A. Of importance here is the fact that the teachers agreed strongly on a set of thirteen value objectives and that eight of these objectives were taught with moderate to high congruence.

B. Teacher consensus increased in direct proportion to the degree of abstraction, i.e., they tended to agree on a value objective if it was expressed as a general principle. But they disagreed on specific ways to attain that objective. Although the faculty stressed the value of involvement, for instance, they disagreed on whether race, war, science, etc., was the ideal way to approach the subject. Such differences at the specific level may be natural and reflect the varying interests of the instructors. Perhaps the fact that instructors were permitted to choose what interested them most accounted in part for their success.

C. An overall comparison of congruence factors suggests that the staff was more helpful in teaching values than composition skills. One explanation might be that teachers placed more emphasis on the subject matter of various reading materials than on rhetorical principles. Another might be that an awareness of personal values and life style (I.V.II), for example, are concepts that are more immediate and concrete and consequently easier to comprehend than, say, learning the principles of sound generalization (I.C.7).

D. As with other areas, there was no apparent connection between degree of emphasis and degree of congruence. In fact several of the values which received greatest emphasis ranked lowest in congruence and vice versa. In one instance the teachers ranked the development of "a greater tolerance for opposing views and attitudes" (I.V.1) as its most important value, yet it ranked ninth in order of congruence. Conversely, teaching "a Greater awareness of what important men have thought about various moral, political and philosophical problems" (I.V.12) ranked twelfth in emphasis but first in congruence. Differences in degree of abstraction are only a partial explanation. Other factors might include general resistance on the part of the student due to overexposure to a particular concept, or, in this particular instance,

to ingrained prejudice. One teacher suggested that for this item the difference might reflect that it is easier to teach what to think rather than how to think. Such explanations are mere speculations; more research is needed to identify specific causes.

III. READING

Primary reading objectives fell into two categories, (1) those concerned with the development of sound attitudes toward reading and the expansion of reader awareness, and (2) those concerned with perception of the logical structure of an essay. The teachers identified as their key objective the need to teach the students to read with greater understanding (I.R.1), and they listed three subordinate objectives: recognition of thesis and arguments (I.R.2), evaluation of arguments (I.R.3), and development of good generalizations based on the facts acquired during reading (I.R.6). Since the processes involved in analyzing an essay and constructing one are closely related, it is interesting to compare student responses to reading objectives with corresponding composition objectives. Significantly, the responses were almost identical as indicated below:

Example 1 - Reading Objective (I.R.2): Identify more accurately the author's main thesis and supporting arguments.

Teacher 4.78 Student 3.76

Composition Objective (I.C.3): Recognize major propositions and issues in an argument.

Teacher 4.71 Student 3.37

Example 2 Reading Objective (I.R.6): Acquire and relate facts and develop sound generalizations.

Teacher 4.50 Student 3.25

Composition Objective (I.C.7): Learning the principles of making logically sound generalizations.

Teacher 4.50 Student 3.09

It appears that identical ideas phrased differently or set in different contexts tended to elicit similar responses.

Only two of the seven reading objectives are being taught with moderate to high congruence. Apparently the teachers were helpful in getting students to read more (I.R.7), and think independently (I.R.4), but less helpful in getting them to improve their understanding of what they read (I.R.1) or recognize more readily the author's thesis and supporting arguments (I.R.2), or distinguish between weak and strong arguments (I.R.3). The reasons for this low degree of congruence are complex. Some speculations:

1. At present the Division has no convenient way to measure reading skills, identify skill deficiencies, or teach specific reading skills.

2. Because the English instructors may be unfamiliar with the physiological and psychological problems involved in reading, they may not be equipped to teach reading per se.

3. As already suggested above, the relationship between thought skills and reading skills is extremely close in certain areas, especially the ability to recognize thesis, identify arguments, distinguish between truth and falsity, etc., and a comparison of overall congruence differentials appears to support this assumption. (See Table IV). Many of the problems that affect good teaching of thought skills, therefore, are the same that affect reading skills, and an improvement in teaching one may show a similar improvement in the other. This, however, indicates the need for another phase of research.

IV. WRITING ASSIGNMENTS

The response to writing objectives indicated that the faculty used sound methods for giving and evaluating student themes. Carefully spaced assignments (I.W.4) on a wide variety of topics (I.W.6), their prompt return (I.W.3) with detailed comments about good and weak points (I.W.2), and their discussion both in class (I.W.7) and privately (I.W.1), were selected by the staff as their primary objectives. Moreover, the students regarded their written projects as an important influence on their writing skills (I.W.5).

This area received an extremely high degree of congruence, in fact the students and teachers were in almost perfect agreement in identifying objectives. Apparently, since the writing objectives pertained more to procedures (objectively verifiable) than skills (subjectively estimated), the staff and students could and did reach near unanimity about what objectives were actually employed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations here are intentionally general. It should be the responsibility of the teachers to read the conclusions and recommendations of this report and devise specific ways to improve their teaching performance.

1. COMPOSITION: That the division examine carefully its approach to teaching thought skills, especially argumentation, and that it devise ways to make this portion of its 1A program more effective.

2. VALUES: That the division investigate better ways to make students more tolerant of opposing views and attitudes, and more aware of their prejudices.

3. READING: That the department make an intensive commitment to developing better techniques for teaching reading skills, testing reading skills, and identifying specific reading problems that affect the 1A student.

4. EVALUATION: That the Division initiate Phase II of this study with the following refinements:

   a. Improve the questionnaire by expanding the list of items, eliminating duplications and ambiguities, and making certain that all major activities and subjects are represented.

   b. Tabulate responses separately for each instructor under a coded identity so that we have a record of individual performance as well as that of the department.

   c. Identify strengths and weaknesses of individual instructors as well as of the department as a whole.

   d. Use of the findings as a means of improving the overall instruction of composition.

5. INNOVATIONS: That a Division Innovations, Research, and Evaluation Committee be formed on a permanent basis to continually research new and better ways of improving the curriculum and methods of teaching and evaluating. Among other things, the committee might attempt:

   a. To establish specific techniques and procedures for research into written composition;

   b. To develop more objective and scientific instruments for evaluating student and teacher performance;

c. To coordinate division-wide innovations and research;

d. To conduct follow-up studies on all existing programs;

e. To review and report to the division on outstanding innovations and research in progress at this and other institutions;

f. To acquire a fund of objective data which may serve as the basis for making future judgments and recommendations;

g. To assist colleagues in planning, executing, and evaluating innovations and research;

h. To conduct workshops as needed;

i. To continually define and refine the objectives of the composition program;

APPENDIX

1. Table I -Instructor Identified Primary Objectives

2. Table II -Instructor Identified Secondary Objectives

3. Table III -Instructor Identified Optional Objectives

Tables I, II, and III also show the students' response to the same objectives described. P - indicates of primary help to students; S - indicates of secondary help to students; O - indicates optional help to some students.

4. Table IV -Congruence Between Instructor Emphasis and Student Awareness of Helpfulness of Instructor Identified Primary Objectives

TABLE I

INSTRUCTOR IDENTIFIED PRIMARY OBJECTIVES
FOR ENGLISH 1A CLASSES

(Instructor Mean Emphasis Rating Between 3.75 and 5.00)

AREA	OBJECTIVES	Instructor Mean Emphasis Rating	STUDENT RESPONSE	
			Students Mean Helpfulness Rating	Classification of Objectives: P=Primary; S=Secondary; O=Optional
Composition				
1.	Learn how to use adequate evidence in support of a thesis	4.90	3.82	P
2.	Develop a good thesis or purpose statement for a theme	4.85	4.04	P
3.	Recognize major propositions and issues in an argument	4.71	3.37	S
4.	Learn how to recognize assumptions and inferences	4.68	3.22	S
5.	Recognize and avoid gross sentence errors, such as sentence fragments, comma splices, etc.	4.64	2.97	O
6.	Use specific facts and details to develop a paragraph or theme	4.57	3.97	P
7.	Learn the principles of making logically sound generalizations	4.50	3.09	S
8.	Distinguish between fact and opinion	4.42	3.54	S
9.	Learn how to recognize and define key terms in an argument.	4.35	3.13	S
10.	Understand how to persuade people more effectively	4.28	3.45	S

Table I, Continued p. 2

AREA	OBJECTIVES	Instructor Mean Emphasis Rating	STUDENT RESPONSE	
			Students Mean Helpfulness Rating	Classification of Objectives: P=Primary; S=Secondary; O=Optional
Composition				
11.	Recognize the difference between abstract and concrete words	4.28	3.13	S
12.	Recognize basic propaganda techniques, such as bandwagon, glittering generalities, name calling, etc.	4.25	3.26	S
13.	Recognize the difference between inductive and deductive thought	4.14	2.96	O
14.	Construct a good topic sentence	4.07	3.67	S
15.	Construct a good paragraph	4.00	3.48	S
16.	Recognize basic logical fallacies, such as hasty generalization, begging the question, etc.	4.00	3.15	S
17.	Discover different ways of organizing a composition	3.89	3.80	P
18.	Learn how to classify and divide a subject	3.82	3.08	S
19.	Learn to distinguish between logical cause and mere circumstance	3.78	2.65	O
Values				
1.	A greater tolerance for opposing views and attitudes	4.57	3.65	S

Table I, Continued p. 3

AREA	OBJECTIVES	Instructor Mean Emphasis Rating	STUDENT RESPONSE	
			Students Mean Helpfulness Rating	Classification of Objectives: P=Primary S=Secondary; O=Optional
Values				
2.	A general ability to communicate more effectively	4.57	3.80	P
3.	A greater sense of the complexity of most social issues	4.50	3.47	S
4.	A better understanding of man and society	4.42	3.73	S
5.	A better, more comprehensive view of the world and one's relationship to it	4.42	3.47	S
6.	A greater awareness of one's own prejudices	4.28	3.35	S
7.	An awareness of how and why people are manipulated by others	4.28	3.58	S
8.	A better understanding of oneself	4.07	3.36	S
9.	A greater sense of involvement in society	4.00	3.30	S
10.	A general ability to listen more sympathetically	4.00	3.46	S
11.	A greater awareness of one's own personal values and life style	3.92	3.46	S
12.	A greater awareness of what important men have thought about various moral, political, philosophical, etc., problems	3.85	3.40	S
13.	A greater ability to solve problems and make decisions	3.85	2.89	O

Table I, Continued p. 4

AREA	OBJECTIVES	Instructor Mean Emphasis Rating	STUDENT RESPONSE	
			Students Mean Helpfulness Rating	Classification of Objectives: P=Primary; S=Secondary; O=Optional
Reading				
1.	Learn to read with greater understanding	4.78	3.72	S
2.	Identify more accurately the author's main thesis and supporting arguments	4.78	3.76	P
3.	Distinguish between weak and strong arguments	4.57	3.50	S
4.	Stimulate intellectual curiosity and provoke independent thinking	4.57	3.70	S
5.	Discover diverse points of view and expand one's awareness of alternatives to important problems	4.50	3.37	S
6.	Acquire and relate facts and develop sound generalizations	4.50	3.25	S
7.	Stimulate students to do more reading on their own	3.78	3.42	S
Writing Assignment				
1.	Give the student an opportunity to discuss his paper privately with the instructor	4.78	4.39	P
2.	Carefully grade the papers and make detailed comments about the student's good and weak points.	4.57	4.47	P
3.	Return papers promptly (within a week or two)	4.35	4.26	P

Table I, Continued p. 5

AREA	OBJECTIVES	Instructor Mean Emphasis Rating	STUDENT RESPONSE	
			Students Mean Helpfulness Rating	Classification of Objectives: P=Primary S=Secondary; O=Optional
Writing Assignment				
4.	Carefully space writing assignments so that they do not pile up at the end of the course	4.23	4.49	P
5.	Assign papers, reports, and projects in the course as an aid in influencing writing improvement	4.07	3.69	S
6.	Give the student a wide choice of topics and suggest a variety of ways to develop them	4.00	3.90	P
7.	Bring into the classroom samples of student writing and discuss them	3.92	3.67	S

TABLE II

INSTRUCTOR IDENTIFIED SECONDARY OBJECTIVES
FOR ENGLISH 1A CLASSES

(Instructor Mean Emphasis Rating Between 3.00 and 3.74)

AREA	OBJECTIVES	Instructor Mean Emphasis Rating	STUDENT RESPONSE	
			Students Mean Helpfulness Rating	Classification of Objectives: P=Primary; S=Secondary; O=Optional
Composition				
1.	Learn the nature of a syllogism	3.57	2.52	O
2.	Learn how to compare and contrast a subject	3.50	3.14	S
3.	Recognize the difference between expository and argumentative prose	3.50	2.95	O
4.	In general recognize minor grammatical errors, such as subject-verb, agreement, case, etc.	3.50	2.97	O
5.	Construct a good sentence	3.35	2.93	O
6.	Enlarge vocabulary	3.07	3.39	S
7.	Improve punctuation	3.07	2.95	O
8.	Learn the principles and techniques of the term paper	3.07	2.93	O
9.	Recognize the difference between the denotation and connotation of words	3.00	2.91	O
10.	Learn how to use the library	3.00	2.85	O
Values				
1.	A greater awareness of the influence of the media on society	3.64	3.64	S

Table II, Continued P.2

AREA	OBJECTIVES	Instructor Mean Emphasis Rating	STUDENT RESPONSE	
			Students Mean Helpfulness Rating	Classification of Objectives: P=Primary; S=Secondary; O=Optional
Values				
2.	A greater awareness of the problems of minorities	3.50	3.14	S
3.	A greater awareness of general philosophical, religious, etc., trends	3.50	2.72	O
4.	A better understanding of the characteristics and development of various cultures	3.43	2.48	O
5.	A greater awareness of changing social patterns, esp., courtship, marriage, sex, etc.	3.35	2.43	O
6.	A greater awareness of problems and trends in education	3.28	3.23	S
7.	A better understanding of what the future holds	3.28	2.91	O
8.	A greater awareness of the effect of war and the arms race on society	3.23	2.56	O
9.	A greater appreciation of the role of music, art and/or literature in life.	3.21	2.71	O
10.	A greater awareness of urban problems, such as housing, transportation, crime, etc.	3.07	2.57	O
11.	A greater awareness of ecological problems	3.00	2.91	O

Table II, Continued P. 3

AREA	OBJECTIVES	Instructor Mean Emphasis Rating	STUDENT RESPONSE	
			Students Mean Helpfulness Rating	Classification of Objectives: P=Primary; S=Secondary; O=Optional
Reading				
	1. Learn to read with greater concentration	3.71	3.37	S
	2. Learn to read with greater pleasure	3.50	3.31	S
	3. Discover the general organization of an essay more quickly	3.50	3.66	S
	4. Recognize the characteristics of different styles of writing	3.35	3.33	S

TABLE III

INSTRUCTOR IDENTIFIED OPTIONAL OBJECTIVES
FOR ENGLISH 1A CLASSES

(Instructor Mean Emphasis Rating Between 1.00 and 2.99)

AREA	OBJECTIVES	Instructor Mean Emphasis Rating	STUDENT RESPONSE	
			Students Mean Helpfulness Rating	Classification of Objectives: P=Primary; S=Secondary; O=Optional
Composition				
1.	Recognize the distinctions between different kinds of sentences and different kinds of word order	2.71	2.81	O
2.	Learn how to use the dictionary more effectively	2.50	2.62	O
3.	Improve spelling	2.50	2.70	O
4.	Outline a theme	2.14	3.09	S
Values				
1.	A greater understanding of general psychological principles, i.e., why people think and act the way they do	2.78	3.35	S
2.	A better understanding of the history and development of language	2.57	2.64	O
3.	A greater awareness of the impact of drugs on society	2.50	2.16	O
4.	A greater understanding of the impact of science on society	2.21	2.56	O
Reading				
1.	Learning to read more rapidly	1.92	2.74	O

TABLE IV

CONGRUENCE BETWEEN INSTRUCTOR EMPHASIS AND STUDENT AWARENESS OF HELPFULNESS OF INSTRUCTOR IDENTIFIED PRIMARY OBJECTIVES

AREA	OBJECTIVES	Level of Significance Between Means $\bar{Z}$=Critical Ratio P=Associated Probability Value	Level of Congruence
Composition			
1.	Discover different ways of organizing a composition	$\bar{Z} < 2.576$ $P > .01$	Most Congruence
2.	Construct a good topic sentence		
3.	Construct a good paragraph		
4.	Use specific facts and details to develop a paragraph or theme		
5.	Learn how to classify and divide a subject		
6.	Develop a good thesis or purpose statement for a theme		
7.	Understand how to persuade people more effectively		
8.	Recognize basic logical fallacies, such as hasty generalizations, begging the question, etc.		
9.	Distinguish between fact and opinion		
10.	Recognize basic propaganda techniques, such as bandwagon, glittering generalities, name calling, etc.	$\bar{Z} \geq 2.576$ $P \leq .01$	
11.	Learn how to use adequate evidence in support of a thesis		
12.	Learn to distinguish between logical cause and mere circumstance		
13.	Recognize the difference between abstract and concrete words		

Table IV, Continued p. 2

AREA	OBJECTIVES	Level of Significance Between Means $\bar{Z}$=Critical Ratio P=Associated Probability Value	Level of Congruence
Composition			
14.	Recognize the difference between inductive and deductive thought	$\bar{Z} \geq 2.576$ $P \leq .01$	↓ Least Congruence
15.	Learn how to recognize and define key terms in an argument		
16.	Recognize major propositions and issues in an argument		
17.	Learn the principles of making logically sound generalizations		
18.	Learn how to recognize assumptions and differences in an argument		
19.	Recognize and avoid gross sentence errors, such as sentence fragments		
Values			
1.	A greater awareness of what important men have thought about various moral, political, philosophical, etc., problems		↑ Most Congruence
2.	A greater awareness of one's own personal values and life style		
3.	A general ability to listen more sympathetically		
4.	A better understanding of man and society	$\bar{Z} < 2.576$ $P > .01$	
5.	A greater sense of involvement in society		
6.	An awareness of how and why people are manipulated by others		
7.	A better understanding of yourself		
8.	A general ability to communicate more effectively		

Table IV, Continued p. 3

AREA	OBJECTIVE	Level of Significance Between Means $\bar{Z}$=Critical Ratio P=Associated Probability Value	Level of Congruence
Values 9.	A greater tolerance for opposing views and attitudes	$\bar{Z} \geq 2.576$ $P \leq .01$	↓ Least Congruence
10.	A greater awareness of one's own prejudices		
11.	A better, more comprehensive view of the world and one's relationship to it		
12.	A greater ability to solve problems and make decisions		
13.	A greater sense of the complexity of most social issues		
Reading 1.	Stimulate students to do more reading on their own	$\bar{Z} < 2.576$ $P > .01$	Most Congruence ↑
2.	Stimulate intellectual curiosity and provoke independent thinking		
3.	Identify more accurately the author's main thesis and supporting arguments	$\bar{Z} \geq 2.576$ $P \leq .01$	↓ Least Congruence
4.	Learn to read with greater understanding		
5.	Distinguish between weak and strong arguments		
6.	Discover diverse points of view and expand one's awareness of alternatives to important problems		
7.	Acquire and relate facts and develop sound generalizations		

Table IV, Continued p.4

AREA	OBJECTIVE	Level of Significance Between Means $\bar{Z}$=Critical Ratio P=Associated Probability Value	Level of Congruence
Writing Assignments			
1.	Carefully space writing assignments so that they do not pile up at the end of the course	$\bar{Z} < 2.576$ $P > .01$	Most Congruence ↓ Least Congruence
2.	Return papers promptly (within a week or two)		
3.	Carefully grade papers and make detailed comments about the student's good and weak points		
4.	Give the student a wide choice of topics and suggest a variety of ways to develop them		
5.	Bring into the classroom samples of student writing and discuss them		
6.	The assigning of papers, reports and projects in the course as an aid in influencing writing improvements		
7.	Give the student an opportunity to discuss his paper privately with the instructor		